


superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 15) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendant's motion for partial dismissal (Docket No. 3) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's claims for intentional disability discrimination under the ADA and § 504 of the Rehabilitation Act are **DISMISSED** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **8th** day of **September, 2023**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE